

Appendix 4

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS
(BO/Marks Deptt. of RO/SP & CAD)

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINT AT LICENSEE END

Our Ref: JPBO-1/H-10175

Date: 14/07/2021

Subject: Complaint against M/s. S.J. Jewellers, Dhadda market, 326,
Johari Bazar, Jaipur, Raj.

0. GENERAL

0.1 Complaint No. & Date H-10175, 05-02-2021

0.2 Name and address of the Complainant Mg. Chamundeswari, ^{14th} House No- 264,
17th east street,
Kamaraj Nagar, Chennai
Tamil Nadu.0.2.1 Name and address of the recipient of material - NA.
(if different from 0.2)

0.3 Product and IS No. IS1417

0.4 Specific nature of complaint

0.5 Licence No. & valid upto EML-8400038509, 01/05/2024.

0.6 Is complainant end report available at the time of
licensee end investigation? - Yes.

1. DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

1.1 Date of Investigation 14/07/2021

1.2 Persons contacted Vaibhav Dadda (957115559)

1.3 Quantity under complaint 1 Gold ring

1.4 Whether licensee is aware of the complaint Yes.

1.4.1 If yes, actions taken for the same Jeweller was ready to pay compensation.

1.4.2 Licensee's opinion on the complaint ② The jeweller is asking for further
proof of the article being
testal under their presence.1.4.3 Whether material was sold directly or through dealer,
retailer etc., - Directly.1.4.2 → ① from ring photograph jeweller agreed that ring sold by
him.③ Bill is also from S.J. Jeweller and agreed by jeweller.
④ Ring was made to order piece. They carry out merchandise of
18K 750 usually. On the complainant's insistence, this piece of jewellery
was made. On customer's request, ring was hallmarked and diamond

1.4.2 → Certified by ~~BIS Lab~~ SGL. Hallmarked was supposedly done by Salazar hallmarking or Saritri (both Johari Bazar). The complainant is misleading the BIS and the team to get unwarranted benefits despite a compensation already offered in writing. The complainant threatened SGL Chennai and Jaipur also.

1.4.4 Is product under warranty/ guarantee/service contract? - No.

1.5 Licensee's record of the material under complaint ^{1.5} The licensee claims to have record of the assaying which may be provided later.

1.6 Manner of marking adopted by licensee for the product under complaint

1.6. → Satisfactory except AHC logo is not there

1.7 Has the material been taken back by licensee? No

1.7.1 If yes, observations on the same vis-a-vis specific nature of complaint NA

1.8 Is the batch/lot/control unit under complaint held in stock by the licensee? No, as the piece was especially prepared on order.

1.8.1 If yes, give factory testing details (if carried out on the same) NA

1.9 Any other observations few jewellery articles with improper hallmarking was found.

2. CONCLUSION

As complainant submitted XRF readings from Joyalukas Chennai which is not clear that it is from an BIS recognized centre or not. Improper hallmarking was observed on few jewellery articles during the visit at licensee end.

RECOMMENDATIONS

↳ on the basis of detailed report submitted further action may be taken by competent authority.

Signature
14/07/2021

Sangeeta
14/07/2021

Signature

LOKESH KUMAR, SC-B

Name of IO : Designation :

RO/BO/Deptt.: JPBO-1

Head of BO
Group Leader

cc: i) Complainant-end BO
ii) SP & CAD

Sangeeta Choudhary
SC-B
JPBO-1